REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 28, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Abstract Objection

The abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because of the inclusion of legal terminology. Through this Response, all such legal language has been removed. In view of that amendment, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because, in the Examiner's opinion, none of the claims disclose a "useful, tangible, and concrete result." Applicant disagrees.

As stated in the Background section of the patent application:

If it is not clear who the owner of the bug is, the entry submitter may need to question several persons who are participating in the program and/or model design to obtain the information needed to make that determination. This process can be unduly time-consuming. Even when such efforts are made, the submitter's determination may still be incorrect. For instance, if it appears that the bug originates from a given block of code for which person A is responsible, it is possible that the true origin of the bug is a different block for which person B is responsible. In such a case, resolution of the bug may be delayed due to the incorrect identification of the bug owner.

Applicant's specification, page 1, line 22 to page 2, line 5. Accordingly, it is difficult for human debuggers to determine who is responsible for fixing a given bug. Applicant's claimed inventions greatly simplify that process. As further provided in Applicant's specification:

Disclosed are systems and methods for facilitating bug ownership determinations. In some embodiments, a system and method can be used to automatically generate a derivative database based upon information contained in a bug database, and automatically make a probability determination as to the ownership of a given bug based upon the derivative database. In such a case, a user (e.g., a bug entry submitter) can be provided with information that the user can use to make his or her own determination as to the true owner of the bug.

Applicant's specification, page 3, lines 15-21. Therefore, using Applicant's invention, a debugger can be provided with information that is indicative of the probability as to who owns a particular bug in question, thereby greatly simplifying the bug ownership determination.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the claimed inventions do provide a result that is "useful, tangible, and concrete." Specifically, the tangible, concrete information (i.e., the "probability determination") generated by the inventions are useful to the human debugger in identifying a owner of an encountered bug. Therefore, Applicant submits that remaining claims 1, 10-14, 15, 20, 22, and 27 are proper under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With specific regard to claims 15 and 20, which are alleged to be "just software," Applicant notes that those claims each recite various "means" for doing something. Applicant notes that means-plus-function recitations must be interpreted with reference to the specification. Applicant further notes that Applicant has described various hardware in the specification. Even assuming that one or more of those means comprise software, the recited "means" can properly be interpreted as further comprising a processing device, such as processing device 102 in Figure 1, that executes the software. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 15 and 20 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

With specific regard to claims 22 and 27, Applicant notes that those claims have been amended to recite a "computer-readable medium", which clearly qualifies as a "manufacture" under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-9, 15-19, 21-26, 28, 29, and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Glerum, et al.* ("Glerum," U.S. Pat. No. 6,944,849). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted above, each independent has been amended through this Response. In view of those amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are no longer applicable and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Turning to the merits of the Glerum reference, Applicant notes that Glerum does not even describe a method or system for determining bug ownership. As such, Glerum cannot anticipate Applicant's claims, which are expressly drawn toward such a determination.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Remaining claims 10-14, 20, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glerum* in view of one or more of *Bates, et al.* ("Bates," U.S. Pat. No. 7,096,458), *Booth, et al.* ("Booth," U.S. Pat. No. 5,922,079), and *Walter, et al.* ("Walter," U.S. Pat. No. 4,980,857).

As noted above, each independent has been amended through this Response. In view of those amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are no longer applicable and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

As a further matter, Applicant notes that none of Bates, Booth, and Walter remedy the insufficiencies of the Glerum reference described above.

V. Canceled Claims

Claims 2-9, 16-19, 21, 23-26, and 28-32 have been canceled from the application without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Risley

Registration No. 39,345